DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 248 08 CE 018 935

AUTHOR Burrows, Ann, Ed.
TITLE Common Core Curriculum for Vocational Education. Proceedings, #I: Common Core Curriculum Workshop (Fresno, California, February 23-24, 1976).
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Fresno.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Vocational Education Instruction Services.
PUB DATE Feb 76
NOTE 54p.; For related documents see CE 018 936-971
AVAILABLE FROM Director, School of Family Studies and Consumer Sciences, San Diego State University, San Diego, California 92182

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Core Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Trends; Higher Education; Learning Modules; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Vocational Education; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Proceedings of the first of three workshops held in conjunction with the development of thirty-four core curriculum modules for vocational teacher education are presented. The bulk of this document consists of four workshop presentations given by J. Robert Warmbrod. In the first address, "National Issues and Trends in Vocational Education," emphasis is given to the relationship between the major trends and issues in general education and those in vocational education. Also stressed is the need for teacher educators to have a clear perspective on the purposes of vocational education. In the second presentation, "Analysis of Common Core Components of Management Approach to Teaching Consumer and Homemaking Education (MATCHE)," the results of an analysis of the MATCHE curriculum are outlined. In "Development and Use of Instructional Modules," basic ideas on teaching and learning upon which the development of modules should be based are given. Finally in "Summary of Workshop," the major purposes of the workshop, specific tasks which were to be accomplished, the process which was used, and the outcomes are outlined. Appended are the following: workshop agenda; results of module identification; list of modules to be developed; original MATCHE module format; Common Core Curriculum Format; workshop evaluation sheet; and a list of the names of the workshop participants. (Proceedings of the other workshops are CE 018 936-937; the core curriculum modules developed are CE 018 938-971.) (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED163248

C
C
C

OMMON

ORE

URRICULUM #I

for Vocational Education

PROCEEDINGS

COMMON CORE CURRICULUM WORKSHOP

Airport Holiday Inn, Fresno

February 23, 24, 1976

CE 014 935

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
OVERVIEW OF WORKSHOP	iii
NATIONAL ISSUES AND TRENDS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	1
ANALYSIS OF COMMON CORE COMPONENTS IN MATCHE	15
DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES	24
SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP	34
APPENDICES	38
A Program	39
B Results of Module Identification	40
C Modules to be Developed	41
D Original MATCHE Module Format	42
E Common Core Curriculum Format	43
F Evaluation Sheet	44
G Workshop Participants	47

Funded by: Vocational Education Instruction Section
California State Department of Education
Part F Education Professions Development Act

Workshop Director: Dr. Gwen Cooke, Chairperson
Department of Home Economics
California State University, Fresno

Assistant to the Director: Maurine Vander Griend,
Adjunct Professor
Home Economics

Editor of Proceedings: Ann Burrows

OVERVIEW OF WORKSHOP

Ann Burrows

A Common Core Curriculum of Vocational Education is being developed by vocational teacher educators of California State University, Fresno, under a funded EDPA project, California State Department of Education. The major objective of the 1975-76 project was to identify components from the existing MATCHE[1] curriculum as a common core for use in all areas of vocational education. Working with a nationally recognized vocational educator, Dr. J. Robert Warmbrod, The Ohio State University, the seven teacher educators from the four vocational areas, with the assistance of several local vocational education directors, identified these components at a two-day workshop.

The workshop was organized around several presentations by Dr. Warmbrod each followed by small and large group work. The presentations as edited by Dr. Warmbrod included:

National Issues and Trends in Vocational Education. Here emphasis was given to relationship between the major trends and issues in general education and those in vocational education. Dr. Warmbrod also stressed the need for teacher educators to have a clear perspective on the purposes of vocational education.

---

[1]Management Approach to Teaching Consumer and Homemaking Education, an Individualized Competency-Based Home Economics Curriculum. Cooperatively developed by California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo and Bureau of Homemaking Education, California State Department of Education. Revised and updated by California State University, Fresno, 1975-77. MATCHE curriculum and information is available from ALPHA II, Inc., 2425 Alamo Avenue, S.E., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106.

Analysis of Common Core Components in MATCHE. Prior to the workshop, the CSUF teacher educators and Dr. Warmbrod analyzed the MATCHE curriculum; and this presentation outlines the result of those analyses. This, in turn, served as a basis for further discussion and work by the total group.

Development and Use of Instructional Modules. In this presentation, Dr. Warmbrod outlined some basic ideas on teaching and learning upon which he felt the characteristics of modules should be based.

Summary of Workshop. During his summary, Dr. Warmbrod examined the major purposes of the workshop, the specific tasks which were to be accomplished, the process which was used, and the outcomes.

Decisions made following group work included: agreement as to which of the present MATCHE modules/units were common to all areas of vocational education and identification of content to be included in additional modules; the decision to use the MATCHE format for development of proposed modules and the selection of which modules were to be developed by each CSUF teacher educator.

It is planned that these modules will be field-tested at this stage. Since there is great interest by local education agencies in credentialing and with the Consortium of The California State University and Colleges offering both a bachelor's and master's in vocational education, it is believed that the entire project may be designed to meet various teaching and supervisory needs.

NATIONAL ISSUES AND TRENDS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

J. Robert Warmbrod

Let me indicate what I see as the function of this workshop. I have been operating according to what is called the "purpose" in the workshop program. That purpose is to look at the MATCHE materials and determine some common elements that will be applicable to all areas of vocational education, or more specifically, some common elements in the preparation of teachers in the various areas of vocational education. Once the common elements have been identified, then some of you will develop instructional modules. The end result will be more competent and highly qualified teachers of vocational education.

In this presentation, I would like to highlight what I see as some trends and issues in vocational education today that have direct influence on teacher preparation. In fact, many of these developments pertain to education in general, not just specifically to vocational education. One of the major impacts of what I will say is that if vocational education has a future, which I'm positive it does, it's going to be as a part of the public school system of this country. I think there are some factors operating that may tend to be creating separatism between vocational education and other parts of public education. I do not think that we in vocational education can afford that separatism.

I will attempt to make my comments apply to the specific purpose of the workshop. In other words, what are the implications of some issues and trends for, first, the preparation of teachers, and secondly, for the development and use of instructional modules.

The first major issue I'd like for you to think about will be labeled "the purposes of vocational education at the secondary school level." Perhaps you do not see this as an issue or that the purpose of secondary school vocational education is an area of controversy. I would not necessarily label it as an area of controversy; however, I am convinced that it is an area we must begin to give some very serious thought to. I do not think that we can consider this a settled issue--that the only purpose of vocational education at the secondary school level is to prepare for employment. One reason I make this statement is because of the influence of the career education movement.

Since 1971, when former Commissioner of Education Marland gave a speech about career education, there have been various definitions of what career education is, how it relates to vocational education, and how it relates to general education. Basically, I think, what the career education movement is doing is calling our attention to some important concepts about the psychology of career development. We are being reminded that we had better pay a great deal of attention to how people go about selecting careers and how they grow and develop in these careers. For example, one point being made is that career development isn't a lockstep linear process. We in vocational education need to be reminded a great deal about some of these very basic underlying concepts. My opinion is that we in vocational education have been operating on some fairly shakey assumptions about how young people make occupational choices and the extent to which occupational choices are stable throughout a period of time.

Let's take a look at some of the research that has been designed to evaluate the effectiveness of vocational education at the secondary

school level. Almost every evaluative study of national import has not only been getting a great deal of visibility, but the conclusions tend to shake up the vocational education establishment. Let me read a few conclusions from those national studies. Some of you probably are familiar with the controversial report, Work in America, which was prepared by a group of well-known people who are scholars in their areas of specialty. They looked at the effectiveness of vocational education at the secondary school level; here is what they concluded: "Vocational education in the high schools has failed to give students useful skills or place them in satisfying jobs." The members of the task force preparing the report argue that "skill training in the high school invites too early career tracking and seldom provides students with usable skills." Economists from the University of Wisconsin, who studied a nationwide sample of vocational students three years after they had graduated from high school, branded as a "half-truth" the notion that vocational education is designed to prepare people for entering into the world of work. Even the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education in their 1968 report, Vocational Education--The Bridge Between Man and His Work, warned that "vocational education cannot be meaningfully limited to skills necessary for a particular occupation."

What does this have to do with the preparation of vocational teachers? An essential ingredient of teacher preparation has to do with what types of programs teachers are taught to implement once they begin to teach. If teachers see vocational education as being limited to a "preparation-for-work" purpose only, then they're going to implement programs that are different from programs implemented by teachers who see vocational education as serving not only that purpose but also additional purposes.

i'm going to argue that vocational education at the high school level can serve purposes in addition to preparation for employment. Don't misunderstand what I'm saying. I am not arguing that preparation for employment is not a major goal of vocational education in the secondary schools. I am saying that some students who enter a vocational program that has that major goal also can profit from other benfits of vocational education.

Let me just summarize my position this way. One of the reasons people reach the conclusions about the effectiveness of vocational education that I have just quoted is the separation between vocational education on one hand and what we call general education on the other. If we look at the extreme positions, it falls out about this way. Some people consider preparation for the world of work as the exclusive domain of vocational education, while preparation for life, whatever that is, is considered to be the exclusive domain of the general education curriculum. Those of you who really know what goes on in schools know that degree of separatism is not possible or true. My argument is that we in vocational education must admit that some of the major skills that determine whether or not a person is successful in the world of work are the so-called general education skills--the ability to read, to write, to speak, to communicate, to listen, to use numbers, and to get along with people. We must constantly be aware of the fact that a student learns these skills in general education courses as well as in vocational courses. We need to encourage students to realize that what is going on in English class, what is going on in mathematics class, and what is going on in science class is just as important to success in the world of work as the specific occupational skills that are taught in vocational courses. What I am

arguing is that we have got to break down the walls that have separated general education from vocational education. We vocational educators need to take the initiative in building the case for an integration of general education skills and specific occupational skills in preparing for employment. Let me give you a good example of this separatism. Those of you that are members of the American Vocational Association will be receiving a notice soon concerning a major development in national legislation for vocational education. Here is what is happening. The National Education Association, The National School Boards Association, The American Council on Education, The American Association of Junior and Community Colleges, The Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, The American Association of School Administrators, and The American Personnel and Guidance Association have gotten together to draft their version of vocational education legislation without consultation with AVA officials or vocational educators. If we are now in two camps, as this lineup of educational organizations indicates, it seems to me that is fairly good evidence that we are going to have to get together if we're going to be able to take a look at the total picture.

In the final analysis, the purposes served by vocational education are determined by what teachers do in the schools. We can talk about it all we like, but the actual purposes served by vocational education are what teachers do in the classroom, in the laboratory, and during on-job instruction and supervision. My point is that the preparation of teachers determines to a great extent what the prospective teacher's perceptions are as to what vocational education should be. Therefore, in teacher education programs, whether it's instructional modules that we develop, what we say, or what we do, we are communicating a philosophy or point of

view about the purposes of vocational education in the secondary school. Instructional modules will carry a point of view of what vocational education is. When we instruct prospective teachers in how to develop a vocational program and when we suggest various strategies and activities, we have a great deal to say about the nature and purposes of vocational education. I don't want to go overboard on this particular concern, but I think one of the major issues that is important, particularly in this legislative year, is what vocational education is all about. We are either going to move further in separating vocational education from the rest of the public school curriculum or we're going to attempt to realize that general education is an essential ingredient in adequate preparation for employment.

Let me move to some more issues and trends that we must deal with. I'm going to talk about a package of issues and trends that fall under the familiar heading of competency-based or performance-based teacher education. Competency-based teacher education includes a series of concerns--accountability, individualized instruction, emphasis upon field experience, criterion-referenced assessment, and mastery learning, to name some of them. Now let me get more specific as to the impact of these concerns on the development of instructional modules.

I find it very helpful to remind ourselves as to what competency-based teacher education is all about. Frequently, we have a tendency, I think, to underdefine what competency-based teacher education is. Some claim they have a competency-based approach to teacher education when all that has been done is increase the amount of field experience that prospective teachers get. Others say they have a competency-based approach after they have developed a list of competencies that teachers

should possess. I'd like to share with you an idea that Professor Brody of the University of Illinois made in an address to a group of vocational teacher educators in Chicago about a year ago. His point was that if there ever was a group that should not be threatened by the competency-based teacher education strategy, it should be teacher educators in vocational education. He went on to say that there is probably no group of teacher educators who would admit that past teacher education efforts had been based on an incompetency-based approach.

Each of you who has been involved with the preservice or in-service preparation of teachers has a concept of what a competent teacher is. I'll wager that any of you can walk into a classroom or a laboratory of any school of this state and observe a teacher for at most 20 minutes and immediately get a feel for the level of that teacher's competence. You don't need a long checklist of teacher competencies; you don't need to analyze the teacher's behavior from observing a videotape; all you need to do is be there and observe and sense what is going on. My plea is that we not be overly scientific when we assess teacher competency. I argue that there is a little art to teaching, also.

If we are to understand the competency-based teacher education concept, there are essential ingredients. First is the identification of the competencies that make a difference in terms of what students learn. Second, we need to identify what is the mastery level of competence that a teacher should possess for each of these competencies. Third, we must design educational experiences that will produce these competencies at a mastery level of performance. And fourth, we must measure whether or not the prospective teacher or the practicing teacher possesses the competencies. Each of these phases or steps is difficult

to implement. Thousands of dollars have been spent in attempting to identify the competencies that teachers should possess. Those of you who are familiar with the research that has been conducted at the Center of Vocational Education at The Ohio State University are aware of the fact that since 1968 there has been a project there that is designed to identify competencies needed by vocational teachers. In 1977, the public will get the first look at the instructional packages that are the result of that project. It has taken almost ten years for research identifying teacher competencies to be translated into products that you and I can use in the preparation and in-service education of teachers.

In competency-based teacher education we are dealing with two major categories of teacher competency. One set of competencies is professional competencies -- ability to plan, conduct, teach, and evaluate instructional programs. Then there is another set of competencies that is very important--competency in the science and the technology of the subject taught. Frequently, we talk about those two categories of competency separately. That is as foolish as the arguments sometimes heard in education courses about whether content or method is more important. Would you want a teacher who knew nothing about the science and the technology of the subject that he or she was teaching? Obviously, teachers must know something about the technology or content of the subject taught as well as being expert in the method or the process of teaching. One of the attractive features that I see in the MATCHE box is that it includes both technical and professional competencies. You have some core modules, particularly in the occupational strand, that are largely professional competencies. However, in the consumer approach strand the modules are content oriented.

What are the implications of this for the development of instructional modules? First, instructional modules must deal with essential competencies that teachers must possess. You ask "What are these essential competencies?" I don't know for sure, but I have some ideas and I think you have some ideas, also. I see no reason for us to attempt to go through a highly sophisticated, statistical, scientific approach in an attempt to identify the five most important competencies. I think we have to rely on our own expert judgment. If we don't know or if we cannot come up with some necessary and essential teacher competencies, I think we are in a great deal of trouble. Next, we have to develop learning experiences that will efficiently and effectively develop those competencies on the part of the prospective teacher or the practicing teacher. When we talk about the development and use of instructional packages, we must be aware of the fact that the experiences available to students must be varied. Activities and experiences must be adaptable to the specific desires and abilities of the learner. For example, we must be very careful not to get caught in the trap of defining individualized instruction as studying alone. I suspect that too much of what goes on in secondary schools and universities under the guise of individualized instruction is actually students studying alone, probably with major emphasis on the written word as the primary medium of instruction. I know there are many students at the high school level who do not learn by reading primarily because they cannot read, which means that they do not like to read. Undoubtedly, the same is true of some university students.

The point is, we must devise a series of learning experiences and a variety of ways for presenting information. We must not overlook the fact that teaching is an interactive process; I'm not sure you can

teach a teacher how to teach unless the process is highly interactive. Remember, teachers teach the way they are taught. I have a strong suspicion that most of the teachers you are preparing are going into situations where they are going to be teaching groups of students in rather traditional classrooms and laboratories. If prospective teachers are taught to teach by some new procedure that is almost exclusively individualized instruction, I hypothesize that they are going to revert to teaching tactics they have been demonstrated in the more traditional content-centered courses when they are confronted with a group of students and little if any instructional material that is designed specifically for individualized instruction. Therefore, instructional modules must make possible group instruction as well as individualized instruction.

Another implication as we design instructional modules and instructional strategies has to do with measurement. Traditionally, we have relied upon tests as a major measuring device, except in real-life situations. Those of you who supervise student teachers or practicing teachers make an appraisal every time you see a person teach. You do not give a pencil and paper test; you simply take all of the data you observe and process it in some way such that what results is a grade for student teaching or a rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If you are an administrator or a supervisor who must make recommendations concerning promotion, tenure, or salary, some way you process all the data available to you and the result is "recommend merit increase in salary", "not recommend for tenure", or some other recommendation. What we are doing in these instances is assessing teacher competence -- measurement. We must not assume that the only measurements we can make are assessments

that can be quantified as a score on a posttest that is included in an instructional module. We must be aware of a trap that frequently accompanies an overemphasis on measurement -- a tendency to measure the trivial.

Measurement, the assessment of teacher competence, is an essential part of accountability. I'm only vaguely familiar with some of the things that are going on in California concerning the measurement of teacher competence or performance. Hasn't there been some legislation that mandates that teacher competence be assessed, at least in part, in terms of what the student has learned? Notice that with that approach to accountability we are measuring students' level of knowledge and skill primarily in terms of the technology of the subject. When we look at the teaching process, we assess teachers' behaviors in terms of professional competencies. It is important that we begin to study the relationship between these two approaches to assessing teacher competence. There should be significant relationships between a teacher's level of professional competence and the students' level of knowledge and skill. It is also important that we consider whether teachers who possess different levels of technical competence may need different levels of professional competence. Don't misinterpret that comment to mean that teachers who are experts in subject matter do not have to be concerned with professional competencies. I won't buy that, but I do think there is a relationship between the two.

Let me mention a couple of additional national trends or issues that have implications for what we hope to accomplish during the workshop. A topic of major importance is teacher certification. Obviously there must be a direct connection between competency-based approaches to teacher education and teacher certification and renewal of certification.

Another concern has to do with who will control teacher certification -- state departments of education, teacher education institutions, or the profession. There is variability from state to state, but isn't there a move toward the profession, teachers' organizations, assuming a stronger role in teacher certification? I do not see indications that organizations of teachers are going to back off on some of the demands they're making that relate to qualifications of teachers. What are the implications for vocational teachers? In some states a person can be certified as a vocational teacher with less college credentials than can a teacher of other subjects. In the long run, are the teachers' organizations going to allow that degree of flexibility in the requirements to be a certified teacher? I suspect we in vocational education are going to have to deal with that problem.

Another issue we must deal with is the supply of teachers. In my field of agricultural education, for the last 20 years we have experienced a rather severe shortage of teachers. The shortage has been more critical in some states than others. One of the traditions of some of the vocational education service areas, particularly agriculture and home economics, is that teachers possess a bachelor's degree. This is no longer true even in agriculture and home economics, at least in Ohio. The shortage of degree-holding professionally prepared teachers is one factor that has brought the recruitment of teachers directly from business and industry. This change in the source of teachers could have a great deal of influence upon the kinds of instructional packages that are developed. Who will be using the instructional packages? Will they be persons in a regular professionally oriented teacher education program or will they be people who have been recruited from the world of work

with little, if any, formal postsecondary education? We have found that when you recruit a teacher from industry or business, that most of the time they are highly competent in the skills they are teaching. However, we have found that the business and industry recruited teacher frequently does not respond favorably to the same teaching-learning mode that is used with university students. Teachers recruited directly from business and industry are not inclined to do a lot of reading or to become too enthused with discussions of lesson planning, teaching methods, and test construction. So, for whom are the modules being developed? I doubt seriously whether the same instructional module can serve equally well a group of university students and a group of entering teachers who have been recruited for teaching directly from the world of work.

Let me summarize by saying that as we develop instructional packages, we must pay attention to some of the major trends and issues in education in general and vocational education in particular. One point I have attempted to make is that we make sure that we have a clear perspective of what the purposes of vocational education are. Is the purpose of vocational education only to prepare for the world of work? Can we liberalize that purpose to include the possibility that by studying vocational courses in high school a student is helped to explore the world of work, is helped to make realistic occupational decisions, is helped to realize that further formal education is needed, is helped to prepare for further formal education, or is given the opportunity to develop avocational interests and skills? If we ask students why they enroll in vocational courses in high school, we find that their responses vary from "I enrolled because I want to be a welder, a tractor

mechanic, or a stenographer" to "I enrolled because everything else I've had in school has been meaningless and not worth the time I've spent on it; this has to be better so I'll give it a try".

Remember, we are in the competency-based teacher education ball game whether we like it or not. But let's not lose sight of our major goal. Our major goal is to prepare competent teachers in the first place and to enable teachers to become more competent. Instructional modules are one means of making progress toward that goal.

ANALYSIS OF COMMON CORE COMPONENTS IN MATCHE

J. Robert Warmbrod

Seven persons analyzed the MATCHE box and indicated modules, units, curriculum objectives, or topics that were considered appropriate for a "common core curriculum" for the preparation of vocational teachers. Some of the raters indicated "common core" elements by listing specific modules, units, or curriculum objectives in MATCHE. Other raters listed general topics they considered to be elements of a common core. In the latter cases, I attempted to identify the topics listed with the modules corresponding most closely with the identified general topics.

The summary of the "common core" elements identified by the raters is indicated in the following tables. The modules (and units) checked most frequently are the "core" modules for the three strands in MATCHE. The four core modules for the Occupational Strand were checked as common core elements by all raters. At least four of the seven raters checked the four core modules of the Consumer Approach Strand as common core elements; four or more of the raters checked three of the four core modules in the Economically Depressed Areas Strand. The core FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives for the three strands were checked also by most raters. Two of the raters listed the general topic of youth clubs or youth organizations as common core elements. One rater listed the general topic of professional organizations as another common core element. Teaching strategies and techniques was listed by one rater as a common core topic.

There was only one case where area modules were checked as possibilities for "common core" elements. That case was the Management Area

of the Consumer Approach Strand. In this area a total of six different modules were checked, with only two of the modules (Environmental Issues and the Consumer and Financial Management) checked by as many as three of the raters.

OCCUPATIONAL STRAND

Module and Unit	*Frequency Checked						
Rater:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Core							
I. Analyzing Job Market Opportunities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1. Assessing Job Performance and Trends		0	0				
2. Assessing Trainee Characteristics	0	0	0				
II. Developing Occupational Programs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1. Administrative Approval and Funding		0	0				
2. Advisory Committees		0	0				
3. Planning and Scheduling		0	0				
4. Program Preparations	0		0				
III. Implementing Occupational Programs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1. Recruiting Students	0	0	0				
2. Instructional Program	0	0	0				
3. Employer Relationships		0	0				
4. Job Placement	0	0	0				
IV. Evaluating Occupational Programs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
1. Evaluation Procedures	0	0	0				
2. Evaluating Instruction	0	0	0				
3. Modifying the Program	0	0	0				
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X			X	X	X	X
Housing							
I. Occupational Opportunities	X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						
Foods and Nutrition							
I. Occupational Opportunities	X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						
Textiles and Clothing							
I. Occupational Opportunities	X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						
Human Development							
I. Occupational Opportunities	X						
III. Programs for Preschool Children	X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						
Management							
I. Occupational Opportunities	X		X				
II. Jobs Utilizing Housekeeping Skills	X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						

*X = modules applicable to all vocational areas
O = units applicable to all vocational areas

ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS STRAND

Module and Unit	*Frequency Checked						
	Rater: A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Core							
I. Characteristics of Areas	X		X	X		X	X
1. Criteria	0						
2. Area Needs	0						
3. Community Structure	0						
II. Life-Style Characteristics	X		X	X			X
1. Values and Goals							
2. Environmental Influences	0						
3. Cultural and Social Influences	0						
4. Economic Influences							
5. Influences of Mass Media							
III. Community Resources	X			X			X
1. Identification of Resources							
2. Analysis and Utilization							
IV. Developing and Implementing Programs	X	X		X			X
1. Curriculum Modification	0	0					
2. Teaching Techniques	0	0					
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X			X	X	X	X
Housing							
I. Low Income Housing	X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						
Foods and Nutrition							
I. Food Availability	X						
II. Low Income Food Patterns	X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						
Textiles and Clothing							
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						
Human Development							
I. Characteristics of EDA Families	X			X			
II. Child and the EDA Family	X						
III. Resources for the EDA Family	X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						
Management							
I. Management Skills	X						
II. Money Management	X						
III. Marketing Practices	X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						

*X = modules applicable to all vocational areas
O = units applicable to all vocational areas

CONSUMER APPROACH STRAND

Module and Unit	*Frequency Checked						
	Rater:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Core								
I. Life-Styles and the Consumer		X		X	X	X		
1. Components of Life-Styles		0		0				
2. Effects of Values and Goals		0						
3. Developing a Life-Style		0						
II. Community Consumer Resources		X	X	X	X		X	X
1. Resource Characteristics		0		0				
2. Factors Which Influence Use		0		0				
3. Factors Influence Decision Making			0					
III. Consumer Rights and Responsibilities		X	X		X		X	X
1. Consumer Rights								
2. Consumer Responsibilities			0					
IV. Incorporating the Consumer Approach		X			X	X	X	
1. Who Are Your Pupils?		0						
2. Pupils' Consumer Needs		0						
3. Meeting Pupils' Consumer Needs		0						
4. Teacher Need to Know								
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives		X			X	X	X	X
Housing								
I. Consumer Use of the Community		X						
II. Procedures for Selecting a Community		X						
III. Procedures for Selecting Housing		X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives		X						
Foods and Nutrition								
III. Consumer Aspects in Planning Meals		X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives		X						
Textiles and Clothing								
II. Sociological, Psychological, and Economic Factors					X			
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives		X						
Human Development								
I. Societal Changes Affecting the Family		X						
III. Financial Pressures and the Life Cycle		X						
IV. Individuals and Families in Crisis		X						
V. Consumer Aspects of Parenthood		X						
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives		X						

*X = modules applicable to all vocational areas
0 = units applicable to all vocational areas

Module and Unit	*Frequency Checked						
Management — Rater:	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I. National and Consumer Economics				X			
II. Consumer Legislative Issues	X			X			
III. Environmental Issues and the Consumer	X	X		X			
IV. Financial Management	X	X		X			
V. Credit	X	X					
VII. The Metric System		X		X			
FHA-HERO Emphasis Objectives	X						

Common Core Components in MATCHE

The analysis reveals clearly that the prospects for "common core" elements are the core modules (or units) in the three strands in MATCHE. There is agreement among the raters that the four core modules in the Occupational Strand are appropriate for the common core curriculum. At least three, and possibly all four, of the core modules of the Economically Depressed Areas Strand are recommended by the raters as possibilities for the common core curriculum. The four core modules of the Consumer Approach Strand are suggested by the raters as elements of the common core curriculum.

It is also evident that the raters consider student organizations as another element of the common core curriculum. Perhaps there is justification for a common core module pertaining to student organizations as an integral part of vocational programs. That module could include units such as organizing, advising, and supervising the student organization; planning and evaluating student organization activities; and integrating student organization activities into the curriculum.

The analysis of the components of MATCHE reveals that the following modules are those from which selections can be made for developing instructional modules for the "common core curriculum" in vocational education.

COMMON CORE COMPONENTS

Occupational Strand

Analyzing Job Market Opportunities

Developing Occupational Programs

Implementing Occupational Programs

Evaluating Occupational Programs

Establishing and Using Student Organizations

- Organizing
- Advising and supervising
- Planning and evaluating activities
- Integrating into the curriculum

Economically Depressed Areas Strand

Characteristics of Economically Depressed Areas

Life-Style Characteristics of Economically Depressed Areas

Community Resources for Economically Depressed Areas

Developing and Implementing Programs

Consumer Approach Strand

Life-Styles and the Consumer

Community Consumer Resources

Consumer Rights and Responsibilities

Incorporating the Consumer Approach (in Vocational Courses)

Factors to Consider in Selecting Instructional Modules for Development

In selecting instructional modules for development as elements of a "common core curriculum" in vocational education, I suggest that the following factors be considered.

1. Course structure within which the instructional modules will be used--courses taught by faculty in teacher education vs. courses taught by faculty in subject-matter departments.
2. Instructional strategy to be used--individual study resource almost exclusively vs. supplemental resource for group instruction.
3. Expertise of faculty who will develop instructional modules--teacher education faculty vs. subject-matter specialist faculty.
4. Instructional modules available from other sources.

DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES

J. Robert Warmbrod

What I am going to say is based upon two major ideas. The first is that the format or content of an instructional module is dictated by how you plan to use that module. Another idea is that how you use the module depends to a great extent upon what you perceive the nature of teaching and learning to be. I will begin with a discussion of some general concepts about teaching and learning that I see to be basic whether we're teaching in a classrooom or developing an instructional module.

A point mentioned yesterday was that modular instruction frequently implies, if not dictates, the use of individualized instruction. Yesterday, I made a point that I want to repeat. Let's not interpret individualized instruction as studying alone. Some of the comments I'll make will build upon that idea.

Another concern we have to be careful about is that we sometimes operationalize individualized instruction primarily in terms of reading and writing. In other words, all we do is ask students to read then write, usually answers to a series of questions. If you examine the objectives that accompany some individualized instruction packages pay particular attention to the verbs, you'll find verbs like describe, list, or select from certain alternatives. These are absolutely essential skills and behaviors; however, there are other behaviors that are important also--for example, behaviors like create, perform, formulate alternatives, or take a position and defend it. Frequently, these behaviors have to be developed with activities that go beyond reading and writing.

The most obvious example of the abuse of individualized instruction that I have observed was in an instructional packet for use with high school vocational agriculture students. The study guide was simply a list of quesitons that the student was to answer. All the student had to do was take the reference book, find the answer, and copy the answer in the notebook. Frankly, about all that teaches a student to do is to be quiet for a few minutes, maybe, and to transfer material from a reference book to a notebook. Here is an example of one of the questions--explain supply and demand. The students were high school boys and girls. I don't know how many of you could handle that question; I think I would have some difficulty in writing a very sensible explanation of all the facets of supply and demand. My point is that students need more guidance and structure in instructional packages than is frequently given if all they are asked to do is answer questions.

Let me discuss what I see as some basic concerns about teaching and learning. These basic principles need to be evident in the instructional modules that we develop.

One basic concern that is absolutely essential to effective teaching and learning is that there must be organization and structure. The learner needs to know the overall structure of the content of the unit as well as how each part fits into and contributes to the whole. In other words, the learner needs to see the "lay of the land," needs to know the present location, and needs to know where the road is leading. I think that we should remind the learner of that location frequently. I find this to be as essential in teaching advanced graduate students as in teaching ninth graders.

When we talk about organization and structure, I would like to emphasize what I call the psychological organization of content versus logical organization of content. As experts, you see the content or the substance of the area you're teaching as a logical organization of strands or elements. The expert sees the field as a logically organized body of knowledge. The learner, who is not an expert in the subject matter, doesn't always see that logical organization of subject matter. The learner sees the content from his or her perspective, which is a psychological organization of the content rather than a logical organization. I'll illustrate by using an example from my high school teaching experience. In teaching a topic relating to beef cattle, if I were to take any reference book written by an expert in animal science, the first chapter in that book will invariably be titled something like "The Importance of the Beef Industry," "The History of the Beef Industry," or "The Breeds of Beef Cattle." The expert who wrote the book sees this as the logical organization of subject matter. If I were teaching a group of high school sophomores, where do they want to begin the study of beef cattle? They are concerned with questions like: What do I feed? How do I feed animals most efficiently? How do I keep animals healthy? That is what I call the psychological organization of subject matter. Find out where the learner is and start there. Then bring in other helpful information when it makes sense to the student to do so.

Well, what does that have to do with preparing prospective teachers? I think it applies directly. In courses on methods of teaching, for example, what do students want to study and learn? What to them is the psychological organization of subject matter? I maintain they are first interested in exploring questions like, How do I teach? How

can I handle discipline problems? How do I decide what to teach? If methods courses have content organized in a psychological manner, I suggest these are the types of questions that should be dealt with first. I strongly suggest that in the development of the modules you give some thought to organizing content and activities in a manner that makes psychological sense to the prospective teacher which, by the way, may not be exactly the same organization that makes logical sense to the expert.

Another major point is that individuals vary a great deal in learning styles. We criticize the lecture method of teaching at the college level on the basis that it isn't the best way to teach. All students cannot learn well in a lecture situation. That same criticism could be applied to any technique of learning. Reading an instructional module every day for a semester could be just as boring as listening to a lecture every day. Some students learn best by listening; some learn best by reading; some learn best by getting involved; some learn best by getting into a good argument; some learn best by getting involved in an experiment; some learn best when they are asked to teach someone else.

Let's provide a variety of ways for people to get involved and a variety of ways for people to learn. Can that be done in an instructional packet? Many instructional modules are multimedia in the sense that a variety of activities and resources are used. Again, referring to my high school teaching experience, the best learning experience for some students was for them to listen to a very lively discussion in class. They couldn't read; they wouldn't read, but they did learn by listening and perhaps participating in a discussion. After all, most

of the things they know were learned by listening and participating not by reading and studying.

Another important idea is that probably one of the most important variables that determines the level of competency that a student achieves is time. This is the concept that is basic to mastery learning. Most people, if not all, can achieve certain levels of mastery if given enough time. In other words, we make time the variable rather than the content to be taught or the level of achievement. Traditionally in higher education and even in secondary education, we keep time constant. The quarter or semester is a certain amount of time; the class meets for a certain number of hours. Everyone gets the same amount of time and then we vary the grades indicating different levels of competence. If we really want to see how good we are as teachers, let's vary the time and see if we can get everyone up to the mastery level of competence. This is what Bloom calls "mastery learning." The contention is that if we provide students enough different learning alternatives and enough time, then almost all can achieve the mastery level of competence, provided of course, that they have the desire to achieve mastery. We should remember that some students may not desire to achieve at a mastery level. Teachers probably will not agree with us as to what mastery level of competence is.

Another factor that seems to me to be very important is that there must be active involvement on the part of the learner. Many of my comments have already related to that. The learner has to get involved. How can the learner get involved? The learner can get involved in every facet of the process from selecting goals and objectives to evaluation. Don't misunderstand what I'm saying. I'm not saying that we should

go into a class and ask, What do you want to do today? What I am saying is that as a teacher it is my responsibility to know the general framework of the course and what is to be accomplished. Then I can involve students appropriately in the teaching-learning process. Students, particularly university students, are very capable of formulating specific goals and objectives, of developing or selecting activities they wish to participate in, and of formulating procedures and evidence that will demonstrate whether they have achieved a certain level of mastery. Let me give you an example of how I attempt to implement this idea in advanced graduate courses in research methods. First, within the framework of the general objectives for the course, the student indicates his or her specific objectives for the course--to gain general knowledge about certain methods, to be a more discerning consumer of research, or to write a proposal for a thesis, or whatever it is. Then students are asked to indicate what evidence they will present to indicate that they have achieved their goals. I don't leave that entirely open, however. I require one piece of evidence from all students which is an end-of-course mastery test. Students are free to use that evidence only or to add other evidence if they desire. The student makes that decision. This type of student involvement is possible not only with advanced graduate students but with undergraduates and high school students as well. It is important to note and I'll comment upon it a few minutes, students who have never operated in this manner have to learn how to use this mode of teaching and learning.

The last major idea about teaching and learning that I want to mention relates to feedback. It is absolutely essential that both the learner and the teacher get almost continuous feedback, either of a

formal or an informal nature, as to how things are going. Students rightfully demand that. Have you ever been in a course where you didn't know where you stood in terms of a grade until a week before the end of the course? We must build into the instructional modules ways in which students get feedback in terms of how well they are achieving. Teachers also need feedback concerning their performance. One of the most effective ways for a teacher to get feedback is to keep his or her eyes and ears open. If there's anything significant going on that is either favorable or unfavorable, you're either going to see it or hear about it.

With these basic ideas about teaching and learning, let's talk more specifically about instructional module development and some characteristics that modules ought to have. First, the instructional module needs to make the organization and structure of the content of the module clear. One way of doing that is through clearly stated objectives. Notice I didn't use the terms "behavior objective" or "performance objective." The primary criterion is that the objectives communicate clearly to the learner what knowledge or skill is to be developed. An instructional module, then, has to some way communicate to the learner, here is the "lay of the land"; here is what it's all about. One way to communicate is through objectives.

Second, an instructional module ought to provide for a variety of learning experiences and it should be flexible. If there's one characteristic of individualized instruction that is not desirable, it is the quality of being too rigid. Inflexibility absolutely flies in the face of what individualized instruction is supposed to be. So we must build in a variety of activities that provide flexibility. I

would like to see instructional modules that teach students to make decisions as well as teach content. We teach students to make decisions by allowing them to make some decisions, and in the process of making these decisions they learn something about decision making. I'm not sure that they're going to automatically transfer that to other decisions they have to make unless we help them make that transfer. Instructional modules can be designed that allow students to make decisions like: from this list of objectives, these are the ones that I really need to concentrate on; these are the learning activities that I need to participate in; here are the ways that I will demonstrate competence; and here are the kinds of evidence that I will present. We need to give options from which students can choose, but we need also to allow them to create their own options.

Another facet of an instructional module is that it must provide some means for evaluation, appraisal, and diagnosis. These procedures must be built into the module so the teacher and the learner can diagnose and evaluate progress. Evaluation needs to be continuous. Diagnosis and evaluation need to be accompanied by prescriptions concerning how the student can correct and improve areas where weaknesses and lack of competence are demonstrated. In designing instructional modules we must be careful not to equate amount of time spent on an activity and quantity of work produced as the only criteria indicating level of competency. What we're interested in is quality or level of competency, and it may take some students three weeks to get at the same level of competency that some students can achieve in one day. Some students may need to accomplish several activities to achieve a mastery level of competence; others may achieve mastery with only one or two

learning activities. We must be concerned with quality and level of competence and not just simply look at quantity of material produced, number of activities participated in, and amount of time spent on certain activities.

Just a few more points and I'll conclude. Students, whether graduate students, undergraduates or high school students, have to be taught how to use instructional modules or individualized instructional materials. We cannot tell students to use a new system of modular instruction unless we teach them to use the system properly. This means that we begin where the student is. If students have been taught by lecture in the past, perhaps we had better begin with a lecture on how to use instructional modules. Then, we gradually teach students how to use the new system.

I want to re-emphasize a point I made yesterday--the point is that teaching is an interactive process. I think there are some behaviors that can only be taught well, if at all, by interacting with other people. We put a great deal of emphasis on human relations, and I don't know how anyone can learn about human relations unless they relate to other people. If we're going to teach human relations skills in the classroom and laboratory, it seems to me that we will have to involve students in activities other than individual study of an instructional module.

Again, I want to reiterate a point I made yesterday. Teachers tend to teach the way they were taught. I believe that most of the secondary teachers you are preparing and most of the secondary teachers you supervise usually operate in group settings. Their teaching is not primarily through the use of instructional modules or other

individualized instruction approaches. We must teach students to operate in the situation they will experience. If the way we teach prospective teachers is completely different from the way they can operate in the schools where they teach, then I suspect we have not helped them a great deal.

Let's remember, there is nothing magic about instructional modules. It is another strategy that can contribute to effective teaching and learning. If instructional modules do not contribute to that goal, it is probably a waste of the student's time to use them and a waste of your time to develop them.

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP

J. Robert Warmbrod

I will organize my summary comments around these headings: major purpose; specific tasks to be accomplished; the process; and outcomes. The purpose is very clearly indicated in the program. Our major goal was to select common core elements concerning teacher education that are applicable to all vocational education areas. Two specific tasks had to be accomplished. One was to select the common core elements. The other task was to develop a format for the instructional modules that are to be developed.

The process was well designed to bring about these outcomes. You began with what had already been done; in other words, you didn't assume you were going to rediscover America. You started with the MATCHE box. Obviously a tremendous amount of work has gone into developing the MATCHE box. The framework was there; therefore, the strategy was to take that and use it as the starting point.

Another very important ingredient that I saw in the process was the persons involved. First, there are some of you who are experts in the content and organization of the MATCHE box. I perceive that Maurine is generally recognized as the resident expert when it comes to MATCHE.

Another group of experts includes those of you who are going to do the work from here on out--the writers of the instructional modules who represent the various instructional areas of vocational education on your campus. Each of you was asked to analyze the MATCHE box and identify common core elements. Then those reports were sent to me, which meant that I had to analyze the MATCHE box before I could make any sense out of what you said in your letters and reports. I deliberately

chose to make my analysis of MATCHE before I looked at your reports. As my earlier comments indicated, I think we agreed on our analyses.

Then you involved another group of people--State Department personnel, local directors and coordinators, and regional district personnel. I think that is very wise. First of all, they have an input to make because they see teachers from a different perspective than we see them. Even though we work with them as prospective teachers, and even after they get on the job, I think they see teachers from a different point of view. Their input into the selection of common core modules and the format of modules is very valuable.

Another very important group of people who have been involved includes the Deans, Department Chairpersons, and others in responsible positions who have attended the workshop. I compliment Gwen on accomplishing this. Their attendance and participation indicates interest in and support for what you are doing.

Now, what are the outcomes? We have selected the general common core elements. They are indicated in the preceding outline. I believe you want me to review them briefly so they will be in the proceedings. We agreed that the basis for the common core elements is the four modules from the occupational strand of the MATCHE box.

The first module is "Analyzing Job Market Opportunities." We agreed that some of the additional concerns that you listed yesterday to be included under that general heading would be population needs, job requirements, and needs in regional occupational centers or the regional occupational programs.

The second major module is "Developing Occupational Programs." There we suggested, in addition to the areas listed in MATCHE, topics

about philosophy and scope of vocational education, student organizations, and assessing needs of disadvantaged students.

The third module is "Implementing Occupational Programs." We added topics here pertaining to instructional technology and the general area of safety that was mentioned by several groups yesterday.

The fourth module is "Evaluating Occupational Education Programs." The addition to the MATCHE box here has to do with the follow-up of students as a form of evaluation.

As for the specific content of the modules and units you will develop, I conclude that you will develop those that appear to be most appropriate at this time. I don't know how many different units we have listed for the four modules, but I am sure there are more than eight. The writers will have to determine content. I have suggested that one way to develop content is to ask this question: What do people need to know and be able to do once they have finished this unit? The way to communicate would be to write your answer to that question in the form of objectives for the unit. Then I suggest that the writing team get together and exchange objectives as a way of clarifying objectives, as a way of avoiding duplication, and as a way of identifying gaps.

The only thing left to do is go to work. I suggest that periodically you have lunch or dinner together. In fact, I highly recommend that you have dinner together and invite Professor Nury for instruction on the selection, the care, and proper use of wines when dining.

Now a few miscellaneous comments. I'm sure it was planned this way, but I think it absolutely necessary that you hold meetings of this type away from campus. Getting away from your office and the campus has allowed you to concentrate on the project. I have a feeling that you

are really tuned in to what's going on. Now, I know tomorrow when you get back to your offices that there are other things that are going to come to the top of the list, but I think for these two days this project has been top priority.

The last comment I have to make is to indicate my appreciation to Gwen for inviting me to participate in the project. I have never enjoyed a work assignment any more than I have these two days. I appreciate the opportunity. I have learned a great deal about vocational education in California. Also, I now know more about proper dining with California wines. Gwen, that's the way I wrap it up.

APPENDICES

CCC WORKSHOP

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - COMMON CORE CURRICULUM

PURPOSE: To identify MATCHE* components common to all vocational areas and to select vocational education modules for development.

Airport Holiday Inn - Fresno
February 23 - February 24, 1976

Monday, February 23

9:30	Registration - Coffee
10:00	Welcome - Gwen Cooke
10:15	National Issues and Trends in Vocational Education - J. Robert Warmbrod
11:00	Take a Break
11:15	Analysis of Common Core Components in MATCHE - J. Robert Warmbrod
12:15	Luncheon
1:30	Group Work Session - Module Identification (title and content)
3:30	Group Reports

Tuesday, February 24

9:30	Development and Use of Instructional Modules - J. Robert Warmbrod
10:30	Take a Break
10:45	Models - Module Format - Maurine Vander Griend Gwen Cooke
11:15	Group Work - Selection of Module Format
12:15	Luncheon
1:30	Group Work - Development of Selected Modules
3:30	Summary of Workshop - J. Robert Warmbrod

*MATCHE - Management Approach to Teaching Consumer and Homemaking Education

CONSULTANT:

- J. Robert Warmbrod
  Professor, Agricultural Education
  The Ohio State University

TEACHER EDUCATORS: (California State University, Fresno)

- Ann Bauer
  Assistant Professor, Home Economics
- Lloyd Dowler
  Professor, Agricultural Education
- Frances Harkins
  Associate Professor, Home Economics
- Kenneth Moshier
  Assistant Professor, Industrial Arts and Technology
- Dwayne Schramm
  Professor, Office Administration
- Gayle Sobolik
  Associate Professor, Office Administration
- Gary Winegar
  Associate Professor, Industrial Arts and Technology

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS: (California State University, Fresno)

- Gwen Cooke - Home Economics
- Berle Haggblade - Office Administration
- Fred Nury - Agricultural Industry and Technology
- Frank Schroeter - Industrial Arts and Technology

WORKSHOP EVALUATOR:

- Ruby Trow
  Associate Professor, Home Economics
  California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

WORKSHOP DIRECTOR:

- Gwen Cooke
  Chairwoman, Department of Home Economics
  California State University, Fresno

ASSISTANT TO DIRECTOR:

- Maurine Vander Griend
  Adjunct Professor
  California State University, Fresno

Funded by: Vocational Education Instruction Section
California State Department of Education
Part F Education Professions Development Act

APPENDIX B

RESULTS OF MODULE IDENTIFICATION

Editor's note: After several discussion periods, it was the decision of the total group that the core of the MATCHE Occupational Strand, Establishing Occupational Programs, was the most applicable to all areas of vocational education. Below are the original MATCHE headings plus suggested additional modules needed for the common core. These additional modules are marked with an asterisk.

I. Analyzing Job Market Opportunities
   Assessing Job Performance and Job Market Trends
   Assessing Trainee Characteristics

II. Developing Occupational Programs
   *Philosophy and Scope of Vocational Education
   Administrative Approval and Funding
   Advisory Committee
   Planning and Scheduling an Occupational Program
   Program Preparation
   *Youth Organization
   *Disadvantaged Student

III. Implementing Occupational Programs
   Recruiting Students
   Instructional Program
   Sound Employer Relationships
   Job Placement
   *Safety
   *Guidance and Counseling

IV. Evaluating Occupational Programs
   Evaluative Procedures for Local Programs
   Evaluating Instruction
   Modifying the Program
   *Evaluation Models

APPENDIX C

MODULES TO BE DEVELOPED

Module:	Developed by CSUF Teacher Educator:
Assessing the Job Market and Employment Trends	Dr. Dwayne Schramm, Professor Office Administration Department School of Business
Assessing Trainees' Characteristics	Dr. Gayle Sobolik, Professor Office Administration Department School of Business
Student Organizations	Lloyd Dowler, Professor Agricultural Industry and Education Department School of Agricultural Sciences
Assessing the Needs of the Disadvantaged Student	Lloyd Dowler
Safety	Dr. Gary Winegar, Associate Professor Industrial Arts and Technology Department School of Professional Studies
Guidance and Counseling	Dr. Kenneth Moshier, Assistant Professor Industrial Arts and Technology Department School of Professional Studies
Evaluation Models	Fran Harkins, Associate Professor Home Economics Department School of Professional Studies
Evaluation Procedures for Local Programs	Ann Bauer, Associate Professor Home Economics Department School of Professional Studies

Appendix D

Original MATCHE Module Format

MODULE OBJECTIVE

MODULE OVERVIEW

PRE/POST TEST - ANSWER KEY

- UNIT 1
  - Objective (enabling)
  - Overview
    - Lesson 1
      - Narrative Summary
      - Suggested Activities
      - Suggested Resources
      - Progress Check (optional)
    - Lesson 2...
    - Lesson 3...
  - Unit Progress Test/Answer Key
- UNIT 2...
- UNIT 3...

MODULE POSTTEST

Appendix E

Common Core Curriculum Format

(modified MATCHE Model)

MODULE OBJECTIVE

MODULE OVERVIEW

SUGGESTED RESOURCE MATERIALS FOR ENTIRE MODULE

MODULE PRE/POST TEST WITH ANSWER KEY

- Lesson 1
  - Objective
  - Overview
  - Suggested Activities
  - Suggested Resources
- Lesson 2...
- Lesson 3...

MODULE POSTTEST

APPENDIX F

COMMON CORE CURRICULUM WORKSHOP

EVALUATION

I. Please rank each of the following portions of the workshop relative to its value to you as a workshop participant.

	extremely valuable	of some value	interesting but of little use--value	of no value	N/A
1. National Issues and Trends in Vocational Education					
2. Analysis of Common Core Components in MATCHE					
3. Module Identification (group)					
4. Development and Use of Instructional Modules					
5. Models - Module Format					
6. Development of Selected Modules (group)					
7. Workshop Summary					

II. Please indicate which of the following categories describes your role in the workshop.

____ Teacher Educator CSUF
____ Department Chairman CSUF
____ Workshop Leader
____ State Bureau
___ Sacramento
___ Regional Supervisor

____ Local Director of Vocational Education
___ Represent school district
___ Represent ROP program
___ Represent ROC program
___ Represent county office

III. Overall Workshop Evaluation (Rating 1-5 with 5 as excellent, 1 as poor)

☐ 1. Lodging and hotel facilities

☐ 2. Agenda content and appropriateness

☐ 3. Adequate time scheduling for each agenda item

☐ 4. Clearly stated objectives for each subsession

☐ 5. Materials and information received

COMMON CORE CURRICULUM WORKSHOP

IV. Personal Reactions

1. How do you see "common core" modules being implemented?

2. What problems, if any, do you anticipate in the development and implementation of the modules?

3. Additional comments:

APPENDIX G

Participants

Common Core Curriculum

William Bain - Assistant Vocational Director
Fresno Unified School District

Ann Bauer - Teacher Educator
Home Economics Department, CSUF

O. J. Burger - Dean
School of Agricultural Sciences, CSUF

Gwen Cooke - Chairperson
Home Economics Department, CSUF

Susan Cronenwett - Coordinator, Consumer and Homemaking
Education Inservice
Bureau of Homemaking Education
California State Department of Education

Lloyd Dowler - Teacher Educator
Agricultural Industry and Education Department, CSUF

Berle Haggblade - Chairperson
Office Administration Department, CSUF

Fran Harkins - Teacher Educator
Home Economics Department, CSUF

John H. Martin - Coordinator of Consortium Programs
Continuing Education, CSUF

Kenneth Moshier - Teacher Educator
Industrial Arts and Technology Department, CSUF

Fred Nury - Chairperson
Agricultural Industry and Education Department, CSUF

Peggy S. Olivier - Vocational Supervisor, Central Region
California State Department of Education

Maxine Rodkin - Coordinator, Consumer and Homemaking Education
Fresno Unified School District

Dwayne Schramm - Teacher Educator
Office Administration Department, CSUF

Frank Schroeter - Chairperson
Industrial Arts and Technology Department, CSUF

Gayle Sobolik - Teacher Educator
Office Administration Department, CSUF

Ruby Trow - Evaluator
Home Economics Department
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Maurine Vander Griend - Adjunct Professor
Home Economics Department, CSUF

Nona Verloo - Assistant Chief
Bureau of Homemaking Education
California State Department of Education

J. Robert Warmbrod - Professor of Agricultural Education
The Ohio State University

Richard Weigelt - Director, Vocational Education
Kern High School District, Bakersfield

John E. West - Coordinator
Occupational Education
Fresno County Department of Education

Gary Winegar - Teacher Educator
Industrial Arts and Technology Department, CSUF